

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 20-25, 27-29, 31, 32, 34-39, 41-43, 45, 46, 48-53, 55 and 56 remain pending in the application, with Claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 29, 35, 43 and 49 being independent. Claims 1, 7, 14, 15, 21, 28, 29, 35, 43 and 49 have been amended herein.

Claims 29, 31, 32, 34-39, 41 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, independent Claims 29 and 35 have been amended to be directed to a program stored on a computer readable medium. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 101 rejection are requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 15, 17, 18, 20, 29, 31, 32, 34, 43, 45, 46 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,206,735 (Gauronski et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,025,925 (Davidson, Jr. et al.). Claims 7, 9-14, 21, 23-28, 35, 37-42, 49 and 51-53 were rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,130,757 (Yoshida et al.) in view of Davidson, Jr. et al. Claims 8, 22, 36 and 50 were rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al. and Davidson, Jr. et al. and further in view of Gauronski et al.. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In today's computer environments, many users use the same host computer to print data with a printer. If a particular user tries to execute interrupt printing of a print job and such interrupt printing has failed, it is desirable to notify that user (the owner of the print job) that the printing has failed, when that user is using the host computer. In order to achieve this desired result, the present invention can determine whether the owner of a certain print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus based on the job information, and can display failure of the interrupt printing if the owner and the user are identical.

Gauronski et al. is directed to an electronic printer with a scanner, in which interruption of a job to process a special job is effected by interrupting the job currently being scanned by the scanner to scan the special job while continuing printing of the other jobs in the print queue until the special job is ready. The job being printed is then interrupted to print the special job, while resuming scanning of the interrupted job, and then printing of the interrupted job is continued upon completion of the special job. As discussed previously, Gauronski et al. can inhibit multiple interrupt printing jobs, and send to the operator a message that interrupt printing has failed. When the parameters of an interrupt job require a function that cannot currently be performed, such as when a needed type of paper is not loaded in the paper tray, a message is displayed that the system is not ready.

However, Gauronski et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least receiving job information from a printer indicating that instructed interrupt printing of a print job has failed, with the job information including information that can specify an owner of the print job, and determining whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of an information processing apparatus based on the job information, and causing a display unit to display that the instructed

print job has not been interrupt printed, if determined that the owner of the print job is identical to the user of the information processing apparatus, as is recited in independent Claims 1, 15, 29 and 43.

Nor does Gauronski et al. disclose or suggest at least transferring, to one information processing apparatus, job information indicating that interrupt printing of a received print job has failed, with the job information including information that can specify an owner of the print job, if decided that the print job is not to be interrupt printed, and the one information processing apparatus causing the display unit to display that the print job has not been interrupt printed, if decided based on the job information that the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus, as is recited in independent Claims 7, 21, 35 and 49.

Thus, Gauronski et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Yoshida et al. is directed to a network system in which each server apparatus can manage jobs requested by a client apparatus by assigning priorities to the job, and can search a job having highest priority at certain intervals in order to execute the job. That is, the order of executing print jobs can be changed in accordance with the assigned priorities. However, Yoshida et al. also fails to disclose or suggest at least the features noted above in the independent claims as being deficient in Gauronski et al.

Davidson, Jr. et al. is directed to a printing system having at least one host computer and a printer. The printer can acquire print job accounting information and communicate this information to the host computer, which can store the job accounting information in a memory. The print job counting information can include job identifier number, job processing time, number of sheets of paper from each paper source, number of impressions from each paper source, port identifier, network user name, name of print job, and printer serial number. The user name can include the host's identifier and the user's identification. As understood by Applicant, Davidson, Jr. et al. is directed to storing of the job accounting information in the host computer, and therefore does not require any comparison between the information received from the printer with other information. Accordingly, even if the user identification included in the information received from the printer is different from the user identification of a user currently using the host computer, the host computer merely writes the received information including the user identification in the memory. That is, even assuming, arguendo, that Davidson, Jr. et al. communicates information similar to that in Applicant's invention, there is no disclosure or suggestion of comparing that information and performing a further task based on the comparison. Nor would such a process be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, Davidson, Jr. et al. fails to remedy the deficiencies of Gauronski et al. and Yoshida et al. noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Thus, independent Claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 29, 35, 43 and 49 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 29, 35, 43 and 49. Dependent Claims 3, 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22-25, 27, 28, 31, 32, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 45, 46, 48, 50-53, 55 and 56 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Williamson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW/agm

DC\_MAIN 219528v1